Why The Senate Hesitates to Censure Dodd, P. 3

The Real Question in Johnson's Deployment of Westmoreland on the Home Front

"What kind of men have we at the helm of government who would deliberately coerce the public into accepting their policies on the threat of being branded traitors?"
—*Senator Hatfield* (R. Oregon) *at Yale, April 26.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 16 MAY 8, 1967 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The G.O.P.'s Gift to The Summer Project

The youthful workers preparing to fan out into the suburbs and the slums this summer to mobilize support for peace could carry no better ammunition than the 91-page "Blue Book," *The War in Vietnam,* issued last Tuesday by the Senate Republican Policy Committee. Its appearance within a week of Gen. Westmoreland's first speech to the AP and four days after his address to Congress finishes off a political defeat for Johnson's biggest offensive yet on the home front. There was first the distinctly sour reaction, even among many hawkish on the war, to Westmoreland's attempt to equate dissent with treason; as a result this theme was reduced, in his speech to Congress, to a muffled warning about "resolve." Now it is clear that Westmoreland's Boy Scout style pep-talk didn't go down too well with Congress. The report approved by the Senate Republican Policy Committee—its chairman the conservative Hickenlooper of Iowa, ranking Republican on Foreign Relations—rebuts the whole oversimplified Johnson-Rusk-Westmoreland theory of the war as an invasion from the North, which can be ended if only the North is "punished" enough to make it call off its troops and surrender.

The War "An Incurable Disease"?

Before Westmoreland spoke there were peace marchers in New York and San Francisco. Now the Republicans seem to be joining the parade. "What precisely," this Blue Book asks tartly, "is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos?" How far, it continues, "are we prepared to go in support of this interest?" It contrasts the record of escalation under Kennedy and Johnson with Eisenhower's willingness "to cash in his chips in 1954, no matter how humiliating it might be to admit we had backed a loser, rather than throw good blood after bad money." Eisenhower, the report says pointedly, "realized the application of military power could not resolve a hopeless political situation in Vietnam." The implication was clear enough for Sparkman of Alabama, Johnson's leading supporter on the Foreign Relations Committee, to cry out that the GOP report would be "a powerful weapon in the hands of Ho Chi Minh." By coincidence, the day the report appeared, the *Wall Street Journal,* in a despairing editorial, compared the Vietnamese war to an "incurable disease." The Blue Book is the first sign that the Republicans for all their confusion, are moving away from the idea that the best way out is the euthanasia of constant escalation, bringing ever closer the national suicide of war with China and perhaps also the Soviet Union.

The Republican Blue Book abandons flag-waving nonsense for astringent fact. The war, it says—

means greatly increased American conscription at a time when the rest of the Western world has done away with the draft. . . . It means spending over $300,000 to kill each enemy soldier. . . . It means a war in which religious controversy between Catholic minority and Buddhist majority has come dangerously close to causing collapse of the successive governments in South Vietnam. Here at home . . . confusion . . . to a degree not experienced . . . since the Civil War. Conscientious objectors today outnumber their Korean counterparts 4 to 1.

It says Vietnam is a country 2,000 years old with "a strong common tradition of fighting outsiders" and the fresh memory of "oppressive occupation . . . by France, a white, western, capitalist, Christian power." It warns that "America, no matter how pure its motives," cannot overcome the weight of this history.

(Continued on Page Four)

The Other Dead-End Street

The Pentagon likes to have plans ready for any contingency. We wonder whether plans have been drawn up for what may happen in the Negro community if the government decides that Martin Luther King, like the saintly Socialist leader Debs in World War I, has to be prosecuted for urging resistance to the draft. Cassius Clay is already on the last lap of court appeals before going to jail. It is no small national problem when the foremost Negro preacher and the foremost Negro sports idol are united in urging Negro (and white) youth not to serve. Clay has lost his world's heavyweight title for opposing the war and King is on his way to earning another Nobel Peace Prize, this time more hazardously. "Every young man in this country who believes this war is abominable and unjust," Dr. King said in Atlanta April 30, praising Clay and criticizing the Westmoreland visit, "should file as a conscientious objector." The silence of the hawks on this increasingly open challenge testifies to the fear of what any effort to prosecute King might set off. King is not the leader, as was Debs, of a badly split minority party. He is both the foremost spokesman of America's better conscience and the Moses of 20 million Negroes, a submerged nation in an ugly mood. When and if the jail doors close on Clay and prepare for King, those Reservists we have been holding back from Vietnam had better stand by. The domino effect could be far more costly than the distant fall of some Oriental despot. Not the least argument for getting out of Southeast Asia is that the war is driving us at home, too, down a dead-end street, toward a head-on racial collision.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After 20 Years and $2 Billions—The End of Democracy in Greece

The *Pax Americana* Brings Fascism to Our "First Frontier of Freedom"

In modern, as in ancient, times the Greeks have shown a genius for civil war. Fraternal feuds have made them the prey and the protectorate (it is hard in practice to tell the two apart) of foreign powers from the days of the ancient Persian, to those of the modern American, Empire. The liberation of Greece from the Nazis, like its struggle for independence from the Turks a century earlier, broke down at the moment of success into civil war. The British reimposed the monarchy in 1945 and backed the right (including those who had collaborated with the Nazis) against the Resistance movement and the Communists as part of a strategy designed for more than a hundred years to keeping the Russians from access to the Mediterranean. The U.S. took over in 1947 from the exhausted British with the Truman Doctrine, carrying on the classic British policy under the new name of "containment." This is when and where the *Pan Americana* began. Greece was our first Vietnam.

Colonels With Birchite Minds

Now 20 years and $2 billion later the facade of success has crumbled and Greek politics face polarization again between a monarco-Fascist military dictatorship and the threat of a new Communist-led Resistance. Not all of this is America's fault. You have to go to Latin America to find parallels for the Greek oligarchy, with its propensity for making money on America's obsession with anti-Communism and salting the proceeds away in foreign countries. And you have to go to the John Birch Society to understand the political mentality behind the coup. Only the kind of paranoid who suspects Eisenhower of being a Communist tool could see a Red menace in Papandreou and his Centre Union party. *Papandreou was Churchill's tool and Prime Minister in the restoration of the monarchy and in launching the civil war to crush the Communists.* To a majority of the Greek people he now seems an elderly Franklin D. Roosevelt, though Papandreou * is really about as liberal as Herbert Hoover. The clocks of conventional Greek politics still run on 19th century time.

Until 1964, rigged elections, fear of a new civil war and a conservative peasantry kept the oligarchy in power. In 1964 a revived and growing middle class made it possible for Papandreou to obtain an absolute majority and give Greece its first taste since the last war of genuinely free institutions. These threatened control of the Army by the King and the right. For months Greek political life has been thrown into convulsions as the Crown sought by bribery and U.S. pressure to destroy Papandreou's majority in Parliament and now to establish a dictatorship rather than risk the May 28 elections he might have won. Apparently the quick takeover plan used by the military was drawn up months ago (the best account is in the reports Bernard Nossiter filed to the *Washington Post* April 30 on his return from Athens) by the King and the Army for the eventuality of a Papandreou victory or a Communist coup. They equated the two, and so—there is every reason to believe—did the U.S. military mission, the CIA and the American Embassy which have treated Greece as a protected province since 1947. We have neither broken relations with, nor ended military aid to, the military dictatorship. For this the thousands they have imprisoned and the press they have gagged can justifiably blame the United States.

The result, by forcing opposition into illegal channels and giving the leadership to those skilled in illegal ways, may ultimately benefit the Communists. Thomas T. Fenton, in a dispatch from Athens to the *Baltimore Sun* (April 30) reports a conversation with a Western diplomat who was there during the civil war and estimates that in those days the insurgents had the support of only 30 percent of the Greek people. "He now estimates," Mr. Fenton cabled, "that if a counter-revolution develops against the military regime, it might enjoy the support of 60 percent of the population." So after 20 years and $2 billion in aid, a new rebellion would have twice as much support as before.

To Help the Greek People

We propose that a national committee be formed to act on the lead given by Walter Reuther to demand that U.S. military aid to Greece be ended until its Constitutional liberties are restored. It was that aid, as Senator Morse said in the Senate last week, that made the coup possible. It was done with our planes and our tanks. In one country after another U.S. military aid has been the instrument for destroying all hope of democracy. The other way to strike a blow for freedom in Greece—and one that lies in our hands and not that of our double-dealing bureaucracy—is to boycott tourist travel to Greece until it is free again. Unless there is swift action now—and a tourist boycott would hurt most—we may see the Greek people condemned for a generation to the kind of corrupt and stagnant dictatorship the U.S. also supports in Portugal.

*** His son, Andreas, whom Cyrus Sulzberger in the New York Times has smeared so shamelessly as a Red, is about as far Left as our ADA. We note (in Le Monde, April 28) that the new head of the ADA, John Kenneth Galbraith, and his colleague, Carl Kaysen, another New Frontiersman (both men knew Andreas as an economics professor in this country) have cabled his American-born wife that they asked the White House to intervene for her husband. He faces death on trumped-up charges of treason in a military court martial.**

Hot Summer Advice Which Ought to Be Posted in Every Police Station of the Land

"The use of racial eptihets, such as 'nigger', 'coon', 'boy', and 'Pancho' appears to be widespread, even though their use is condemned by responsible police administrators. The President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia found that 'offensive terms such as 'boy' or 'nigger' are too often used by officers of the Department. . . . It is precisely this type of language which solidifies the conflict between minority groups and the police. . . . Police should not base decisions to arrest, stop, use force, or the like, in whole or in part, on race, poverty, or civil right activity."

—White House Task Force Report on the Police April 29.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Too Many Other Senators Helped Him and His German Lobbyist Friend

Why It's So Hard for the Senate to Censure Thomas J. Dodd

By Robert G. Sherrill

The Senate Ethics Committee's report on Thomas Dodd leaves out or slips over most of the really big questions.

Contrary to the Committee's emphasis, Sen. Dodd's greatest mischief was not in misusing at least $150,000 (three times what Adam Clayton Powell got in kickbacks from his staff), but in promoting a foreign agent hired by West German right-wingers to drag this country deeper into the Cold War.

Klein's Other Friends

The Committee report brushes this off as being "indiscreet" but not deserving punishment, and fails to mention that its hearings had found this indiscretion being shared in varying degrees by Hubert Humphrey, Speaker McCormack, and Senators Dirksen, Javits, Morse and Symington. All helped protect the smudged career of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein (ret.), who was paid not only by Bonn hardliners but also by major German bankers and industrialists (the Ethics Committee delicately agreed not to ask Klein to identify them). What Klein had to sell these German clients were his friendly relations with these liberal Senators and his position as head of the Jewish War Veterans. This last detail is the most nauseating.

Letters and memos introduced at the hearings show that Klein looked upon the Senators as lackies (Humphrey and Symington, he thought, would hop over to Europe any weekend to do him a favor) and that he had some grounds for feeling that way. After Senator Fulbright's 1963 investigation of foreign agents had revealed Klein to be something of a pest around the capitol, his German industrial clients began quitting him. To win them back, Klein put his Senate pals to work.

Obediently Dodd visited Adenauer, Erhard and other key German politicians in 1964 to discredit Fulbright and tout Klein as one of Congress's most valued councillors and therefore worthy of Germany's continued hire. Apparently Klein had doubts about his stooge's capabilities; before Dodd left for Europe he received a memo from Klein advising him to "let Jack Javits brief you again! Also Dirksen, Humphrey, Morse and Symington."

Javits had preceded Dodd on the same sort of Klein-polishing mission. Morse, meanwhile, was writing letters of advice and praise to neutralize the "Fulbright blight" on Klein's career. Humphrey too wrote gushing letters for "my dear friend" which Klein was not only authorized but encouraged to show to his client's abroad (clients who favored a tougher NATO, a hard policy in Vietnam and in the Congo, an inflexible enmity toward Russia), letters attesting to Klein's "host of friends in Congress . . . in both poltical parties." Speaker McCormack, drawing on their mutual ties with the Vatican, put in a good word with Dr. Ludger Westrick, then Erhard's under secretary of commerce whom Klein described as "important to me to [keep] my commercial clients." Klein compared Westrick to Robert McNamara in this country. Dodd was not the only one to spend taxpayers' time and money to help a foreign agent, though the Ethics panel acts as if he were.

Considering its dripping apathy, one wonders if the panel would have acted at all without constant pressure from Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson, who first exposed the scandal. It refused to judge charges that Dodd had accepted money from drug, firearm and insurance industries he was supposedly investigating or about to investigate. Like Powell, Dodd was also accused of deadheading his payroll—but this wasn't investigated either.

Even in dealing with the bogus fund-raising affairs, the Committee's report leaves much to the imagination. Of the seven testimonial occasions, Johnson was featured guest at four, Humphrey at another. Thus five times in less than four years a vice president took time off to help Dodd pass the hat, but the Committee fails to see any unusual compassion in that. Was ever a Senator so loved?

If Dodd Had Only Done What Javits Did

SEN. McCARTHY (D. Minn.): I gather . . . that you would have been quite satisfied had Senator Dodd come to Germany and said in your behalf or done in your behalf whatever it was that Senator Javits said or did in your behalf in Germany.

GEN. KLEIN: That is right.

McCARTHY: Whatever that was, it would have satisfied you?

KLEIN: I wouldn't say whatever that was. I mean I think the Senator should be kind enough to be more explicit. I wouldn't ask any Senator to do anything wrong. . . .

McCARTHY: I wasn't asking you to tell what Senator Javits did. But you would have been satisfied if Senator Dodd had come to Germany and done whatever Senator Javits did?

KLEIN: That is right.

—Stennis Committee Hearings on Dodd: p. 537.

Klein to Dodd: Tell the Germans I'm Offsetting the Effects of Auschwitz

"Senator Javits visited you on behalf of the Republicans, and brought you the special message of support from my good friend, the Senate Minority Leader, Senator Everett Dirksen who comes from the state of Illinois—General Klein's home state. I am here on behalf of my Democratic colleagues. . . . There are a lot of appeasers and do-gooders. The wounds of the Hitler era have not healed and never will heal, as the present Auschwitz trials show. The communists and left-wingers are taking advantage of this, and are utilizing the trials and the Hitler period for propaganda in the United States. To offset this . . . the help of General Klein and his organization has been of great assistance to us. . . . He deserves not only our gratitude but yours—and your continued support. This is the reason I am here to explain. We hope this pleasant relationship will contine.

"The city of Berlin headed by Socialist Mayor Willy Brandt is doing a splendid job through an American public relations agency in the United States. . . . A huge amount is spent by the Berlin city council but it is of course necessary not to overlook the importance of the national public relations for the entire Federal Republic. . . ."

—From Hearings Exhibit 17: script prepared by lobbyist Major Gen. Julius W. Klein for Senator Thomas J. Dodd to recite when meeting Chancellor Erhard in 1964.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Must We 'Pacify' Them, If They're Victims of Aggression?

(Continued from Page One)

One passage of Westmoreland's speech to Congress was downright idiotic—his assertion that "in three years of close study and daily observation" he had seen "*no* evidence" (our italics) "that this is an internal insurrection." This ignores the overwhelming weight of scholarship, all that was learned from Diem's downfall and the plain implication of our own "pacification" and "revolutionary development" program. If this is simply invasion from the North, why do we have to "pacify" its victims in the South? Who ever heard of having to placate a people saved from aggression? Did we have to pacify Paris after driving the Germans out? Or offer land reform to the French peasantry to reconcile them to the defeat of the Nazi occupiers? Even Generals have rarely indulged in more palpable nonsense.

Viet Cong Not All Red

An altogether different picture is drawn in the Republican Blue Book. It begins by saying that Eisenhower's aid to Diem, far from being an open-ended commitment to military involvement, was predicated on the creation of a government (in the words of Ike's letter, Oct. 23, 1954) "so responsive to the nationalistic aspirations of the people" and "so enlightened in purpose and effective performance" as to win popular support. It was failure to achieve these objectives that led to the collapse of the Diem regime; its undoing was a growing discontent Westmoreland's three years of "close study and daily observation" managed not to see. The GOP Blue Book says a renewal of guerrilla activity was made "both inevitable and successful" not only by the refusal to hold the elections promised at Geneva but by the suppression of "all political opposition in the south, and not just the Viet Cong"; by Diem's reliance on Catholic refugees from the North to govern "the largely Buddhist population of the south" and by his abolition of village elections. "Many of the revolutionists in the South," the GOP report says, "were not necessarily Communist to begin with, but rather anti-Saigon and anti-Diem."

The report challenges Rusk's assertion that Hanoi could end the war "literally in 24 hours." It says the NLF has been "southern oriented" and that "40 of their senior leaders were native South Vietnamese." It accuses President Kennedy of reverting "to old-fashioned gunboat diplomacy" in dealing with this insurrectionary problem and Johnson of ignoring an offer of peace talks from Hanoi after Kennedy's death. It exposes the false assurances with which Johnson obtained his blank check for escalation in the Tonkin Bay affair, which it traces back (as we did in the *Weekly*) not to an "unprovoked aggression," but to a South Vietnamese naval raid on North Vietnamese radar and naval installations.

There is little the critics of the war have said that is not supported and documented in this 91-page study. It makes the same points we did in reply to the State Department's mendacious White Paper of 1965. It criticizes current failure to keep promises of land reform and it spells out the history of opportunities for peace talks we rebuffed. It asks in conclusion, "Does the Republican Party serve America best by saying that politics stops at the water's edge? That we must rally behind the President? Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?" Here from right of center, is new support for the peace campaign.

Bulletin From That Frontier of Freedom

Saigon—Strict censorship of South Vietnam's press remains in effect despite the new April 1 constitution guaranteeing freedom of the press. In the view of both U.S. officials and Vietnamese observers, the provisional military regime of Premier Ky has cracked down even harder. . . . Legislative Assembly debates continue to go either unreported or are given perfunctory or distorted treatment in official handouts. . . . The civilian candidates for the Presidency . . . have been targets of a concerted campaign of smear and ridicule. . . . "When an American reporter protested the prolonged closure [of The Guardian **"the English language newspaper which refused to toe the government line"] to Philip Habib, the former political counsellor [of the U.S. Embassy], Habib reportedly replied, 'Who cares about** The Guardian**? There's plenty of other papers. Besides they provoked the government.'"**

—*Richard Critchfield in* Washington Star *May 1.*

We'll Send Free Sample Copies of This Issue to Your Friends If You Send Us Stamped, Addressed Envelopes—

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

5/8/67

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... **Zip**..... **State**.....

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; 20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED